

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

Attached is a Submission of Replacement Drawing Sheets including a change to each of Figs. 25 and 26. These Replacement Drawing Sheets, which include all of Figs. 1-26 in this application, replace the previously-filed drawing sheets. In these Replacement Drawing Sheets, Figs. 25 and 26 have been amended to include the legend "PRIOR ART" in response to the objection to the drawings in the Office Action.

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

The drawings are objected to because Figure 26 should be designed by a legend such as -- Prior Art--.

Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoneta et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0034496) (hereinafter "Yoneta") in view of Akahori et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0045577) (hereinafter "Akahori").

Claims 2-3 and 7-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoneta in view of Akahori as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Allison (U.S. Patent No. 3,748,546) (hereinafter "Allison").

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoneta in view of Akahori as applied to claims 1 and 6, and further in view of Albagli et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0072931) (hereinafter "Albagli").

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants have amended claims 1, 6 and 7 and added new claims 12-15 to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application. Accordingly, claims 1-15 are currently pending for consideration. A Submission of Replacement Drawing Sheets is attached including a change to each of Figs. 25 and 26.

**Objections to the Drawings**

The drawings are objected to because Fig. 26 should allegedly be designed by a legend such as “Prior Art”. In the Submission of Replacement Drawing Sheets filed concurrently herewith, Applicants have amended the drawings by labeling Figs. 25 and 26 as “Prior Art”. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoneta in view of Akahori. Claims 2-3 and 7-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoneta in view of Akahori as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Allison. Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoneta in view of Akahori as applied to claims 1 and 6, and further in view of Albagli. Applicants have amended claims 1, 6 and 7 to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application. To the extent that these rejections might be deemed to still apply to the claims as newly-amended, they are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Each of independent claims 1, 6 and 7 have been amended to specifically describe that the resin film is configured so that it functions as a cushion layer as a newly-added feature described in combination with the remaining features of each of the respective claims. This feature is described, for example, in paragraph [0062] of the specification of the instant application.

Applicants respectfully submit that Akahori does not teach, or even suggest, the resin film which functions as a cushion layer in the manner described respectively in each of

independent claims 1, 6 and 7 of the instant application as newly-amended. Applicants respectfully submit that while Akahori discloses a silicon oxide film 3 in Fig. 2, the silicon oxide is not the resin described in the claims of the instant application.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because none of the applied art, whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1, 6 and 7, as newly-amended. MPEP § 2143.03 instructs that “[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).” Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that the dependent claims are allowable at least because of their dependence from claims 1, 6 and 7, and the reasons set forth above. Also, the additionally-applied reference to Allison, with regard to claims 2-3 and 7-8, fails to cure the deficiencies of Yoneta and Akahori, as previously described. Also, the additionally-applied reference to Albagli, with regard to claims 10 and 11, fails to cure the deficiencies of Yoneta and Akahori, as previously described.

Newly-presented claim 12 is based, for example, on the disclosure in paragraph [0065] of the specification of the instant application. Newly-presented claim 13 is based, for example, on the disclosure in Figs. 1, 6 and 13 of the instant application. Newly-presented claim 14 is based, for example, on the disclosure in paragraphs [0056], [0057] and [0082] of the specification of the instant application. Newly-presented claim 15 is based, for example, on the disclosure in paragraphs [0100] and [0104] of the specification of the instant application.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.


**EXCEPT** for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

**DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP**

Dated: August 29, 2007

By:



Paul A. Fournier

Reg. No. 41,023

**Customer No. 023973**  
Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP  
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005-1209  
Tel.: (202) 842-8800  
Fax: (202) 842-8465